

Contracting Overview and Tentative Source Selection

Contracting Overview



- Any correspondence pertaining to this acquisition, to include questions arising from this industry day event, should be directed to the below NAVSUP FLCN points of contact:
 - FLCN Points of Contact are:
 - Procuring Contracting Officer
 - Mr. Greg Finke, 1-757-443-2066
 - william.g.finke@navy.mil
 - Contract Specialist
 - Mr. Ricky Jennings, 1-757-443-1456
 - ricky.jennings@navy.mil

Key Points



- The Request for Proposal, attachments, and any amendments will be published on the Seaport-e Portal.
- Separate emails/notifications will not be sent.
- Nothing stated during this Industry Day or contained in any of the documents provided will qualify the terms and conditions of the RFP.
- The RFP is currently being developed and no final decisions have been made.

Projected Milestones



- 21 May 2015 – RFP Published
- 22 June 2015 – Offers due
- June 2015 - September 2015 – Evaluation
- 15 September 2015 – Award (without discussions)

- 1 December 2015 – Period of Performance begins (Transition-in)
- 1 January 2016 – Transition Period ends

- All dates are approximate and subject to change

Tentative Acquisition Strategy



- Type of Order: Firm Fixed Price (FFP)
- Term of Order:
 - Four Years (12 month base period with three (3) 12 month option periods)
- Single award task order (not an IDIQ type contract)
- Note: Proposals that take exceptions to any terms/conditions of the RFP, propose additional terms/conditions, or fail to manifest the unconditional assent to a term/condition of the RFP will constitute a deficiency (FAR 15.001), which will make the offer unacceptable.

Source Selection



- The Government's *tentative* source selection criteria to be used in the evaluation of offers for this procurement is as follows:

Non-Cost/Price Proposal: The Non-Price Proposal is more important than the Price proposal and consists of the below factors and sub-factors. The Non-Cost/Price Proposal factors are listed in descending order of importance:

- **Factor 1 - Technical Approach** (The Technical sub-factors are also listed in descending order of importance):
 - *Sub-factor 1 - Performance Approach*
 - *Sub-factor 2 - Staffing Plan*
 - *Sub-factor 3 - Management Approach*
- **Factor 2 - Past Performance**

Price Proposal: Price will be evaluated in accordance with FAR 15.404.

Source Selection (cont.)



- The following tables will be used to evaluate technical approach and past performance portions of the offerors' proposals:
- The Technical Ratings Table will also be used for the overall Non-Cost/Price Proposal evaluation rating.
- Technical Ratings Table

Color	Rating	Description
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.
Purple	Good	Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Green	Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Proposal is un-awardable.

- Past Performance Relevancy Ratings

Rating	Definition
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

- Past Performance Confidence Rating

Rating	Definition
Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Limited Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.
Unknown Confidence (Neutral)	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

Typical Proposal Shortfalls



- Not being responsive to the RFP
- Regurgitating the PWS
- Proposal instructions not followed
- Statements in the proposal are not well supported
- Proposals are not well organized
- Past Performance POCs are not current
- Not signing RFP or providing all RFP sections completed (e.g. Section K Reps/Certs, etc.)
- Arithmetic and/or spreadsheet formulas are incorrect
- Not explaining pricing approach
- Discrepancies between level of effort in price proposal and approach stated in technical proposal

Closing Remarks